DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 420 HE 033 018

AUTHOR	Shulman, Lee S.
TITLE	Fostering a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
INSTITUTION	Georgia Univ., Athens. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Louise McBee Lecture, University of Georgia (10th, Athens, GA, October 1998).
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute of Higher Education, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-1772.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Finance; *Educational Research; Educational Researchers; Higher Education; Research and Development; *Scholarship; Teacher Associations; *Teacher Role; *Teaching (Occupation); Writing for Publication
IDENTIFIERS	American Association for Higher Education; *Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching

ABSTRACT

This paper, by the President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, advances the need for scholarship in teaching. Just as research is not done until it has been shared, this is true also of scholarship in teaching: it is not private, but public; it is made available to and is critically reviewed by peers; it can be built upon by others. To promote the scholarship of teaching, the Carnegie Foundation has created a new program called the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), the three components of which are intended to enhance the scholarship of teaching in colleges and universities as well as in elementary and secondary schools. The first component, in conjunction with the Pew Scholars Program, is the creation of a Center for Advanced Study, where those devoting energies to the scholarship of teaching have a place to work with others interested in the same problems. The second component, a collaboration with the American Association for Higher Education, is the development of 80 campus-based teaching academies. The third component is working with disciplinary and professional associations to ask how the scholarship of teaching can move from the periphery to the center in their discipline or profession. (RH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 420

Fostering a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Lee S. Shulman

President
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Fincher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Louise McBee Lecture
The University of Georgia
Institute of Higher Education
1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2

HE 033 018

Copyright © 2000 by the Institute of Higher Education
The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-1772

Foreword

The tenth annual Louise McBee Lecture, held in October of 1998, was a special one indeed. Not only was a respected educational and political leader from Georgia honored, but perhaps the country's most articulate spokesperson for the importance of teaching as a scholarly activity in higher education came to our campus to contribute to this annual event.

Dr. M. Louise McBee retired as Vice President for Academic Affairs in 1988 after a remarkable career in both student affairs and academic affairs in higher education. To this day she is one of the most beloved members of the University of Georgia community. And, in her fourth term as a member of the Georgia General Assembly, she continues to serve as one of the most respected political leaders in Georgia.

Dr. Lee S. Shulman, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, is a national figure in higher education. A graduate of the University of Chicago, he went on to notable careers at Michigan State University and, more recently, Stanford University. He has recently succeeded the late Ernest Boyer as the leader of one of the most influential and prestigious educational foundations in the country.

The Institute of Higher Education is proud to sponsor this special lectureship and is pleased to present this monograph of Professor Shulman's presentation titled *Fostering a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. The University of Georgia appreciates the contributions of these two leaders in higher education and is honored by their association with this special occasion.

Ronald D. Simpson
Professor and Director (Acting)
Institute of Higher Education
The University of Georgia
November, 1999

Fostering a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

I find it a great honor to join you in honoring Louise McBee. As I listened to Louise's extraordinary career, the path of her life, and her early years teaching high school, I must say it brought some interesting reminiscences of what I was doing two years ago when I first learned of my appointment to the Carnegie Foundation.

It was an ordinary year for me as a college professor. I was teaching a brand new graduate course on teaching and learning with a colleague, and in a moment of madness, we decided to go back and teach eleventh grade U.S. history at the same time. So we went to a local high school where we had many former students who were on the faculty, and one of them offered us her first-period history class. So Larry Cuban and I taught the only U.S. history course in America that year offered by two past presidents of the American Educational Research Association. Only Larry is a bona fide historian; I am a psychologist.

We arrived at seven-thirty each morning and prepared for class. After class—I won't call it a luxury because we felt it was a necessity—we retired to the teacher's room and for the next forty minutes reviewed what had happened and talked about individuals in the class. This was not an advanced placement class. It was a class in which two-thirds of the students were from the poorest community in the area, East Palo Alto. Two of our students were sixteen years old and mothers. We began calling about eight of the kids in the class

"MIAs" because they usually weren't there. And I must say, Louise, that for those of us who have had the privilege of teaching at every level of this amazing system of education—with all its problems, it is still a beacon of hope—we share a set of experiences that are very hard to match.

The day I began my work, I felt it useful to read the charter for one of the oldest foundations in America, founded in 1905 by Andrew Carnegie and chartered by the United States Congress and Secretary of State Elihu Root in 1906. The charter of the Foundation contains the mission of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. I want to read you a quote from that mission:

> To do all things necessary to encourage, uphold, and dignify the profession of teaching.

It's interesting that when the Foundation was first created, it didn't mean what it means now. The founding myth of the Foundation—I say myth not because it's untrue but because it's so ornamented that I'm not sure which parts of it are true or false—is that Andrew Carnegie served on the board of trustees of Cornell and discovered that the economic conditions of college teachers were worse than those of the foremen who worked in his steel factories in Pittsburgh, especially the fact that they had no pensions.

The Carnegie Foundation was created to advance teaching by inventing a pension system so that college teachers could teach with confidence and retire with dignity. It didn't seem useful to give academic freedom to folks who actually felt indentured because they had no pension to depend on in their maturity.

What's interesting is how the Foundation got into its later role of being a research and policy center in higher education.

The first president of the Foundation, Henry Pritchett, who had been president of MIT, went to Mr. Carnegie and said "You haven't given us enough money to provide pensions for all college teachers." Carnegie, who was not about to give them more money—eleven million dollars was real money in 1905—said, "Well, then don't give them to all college teachers, give them only to teachers in the best institutions, and by the way, don't give them to teachers in any religious institutions." Institutions that wanted Carnegie money had to demonstrate that (a) they were outstanding educationally and (b) they were aggressively secular. Fortunately, to be aggressively secular all you had to demonstrate was that you didn't have a religious quota for membership on your board of trustees. But how do you decide which are the best institutions?

That question led almost immediately to nearly 100 years of studies of the quality of higher education. One of the earliest examples was the Flexner Report on medical education, which was done by the Carnegie Foundation to study the quality of education in schools of medicine. Within ten years after the Flexner Report was published, half the medical schools in the country closed their doors because they had been so critically and publicly reviewed by Abraham Flexner. The notion that the condition of higher education rests on the condition of its teaching is a continuing theme in our work and that is the focus of my remarks today.

What do we mean when we talk in higher education about the profession of teaching? What does it mean to put "profession" and "teaching" in juxtaposition and union when one talks about the conditions of higher education? Now, I find this problematic, because I've spent all of my career, both as a student and as a faculty member at three institutions—private and public—all of which, like this university,

are research universities. I started at the University of Chicago, spent nearly twenty years at Michigan State University, and now about fifteen at Stanford.

I came to understand that teaching at a research university has a very special—often ambiguous, sometimes unresolved—status within the institution. Nearly all of us teach. It's the one common factor in almost all of our careers, and yet if one of us meets someone on a plane or in a hotel, and they ask, "Well, what do you do?", the likelihood is that our response will be "I'm a historian," "I'm a biologist," "I'm a psychologist," "I do work in literature."

Only later in many of these conversations will the fact that I spend an enormous amount of time teaching this field become apparent. In fact, if you're off at a national meeting and you meet a colleague that you haven't seen for a while, and the colleague says to you, "What are you working on?" odds are you'll begin to describe the research project that's underway, the book that remains unfinished—we used to say on your desk but now we say on your hard disk—for far too many years, the proposal that you've just sent off to the National Science Foundation or the National Endowment for the Humanities. When asked, we tend to respond in terms of our disciplinary or professional scholarship. It's very rare if the first thing we talk about is the new course we're designing or the committee we're on to redesign the curriculum of our department or create a new interdisciplinary program.

Again, there's a sense in which the culture of our work privileges one aspect of our profession—that defined by our discipline and our domain of research—and subordinates the teaching function which almost all of us share. At the places I've been, there is even the scurrilous rumor that the worst thing that can happen to an untenured assistant professor is to

win a teaching award. The next thing you know, they've not been promoted and they're working somewhere else.

I chaired the University Committee on Teaching at Stanford at the same time that I was chairing the all-University Committee on Promotions and Tenure. Talk about schizophrenia! We did focus groups with assistant professors and recently tenured associate professors, and the recurring theme was "we got the message clearly, until you're tenured don't waste a lot of your time on teaching. Do what you have to do, and then devote your time to writing and publishing."

My own view is that universities and colleges are the one institution in the world where the promotion of understanding is an end in itself. Seeking understanding in ways that permit you not to keep it to yourself, but obligate you to give it away freely, defines the fundamental nature and culture of the institution. We don't have philosophy and literature departments because the research done there promotes the economy. We have them because they have an indispensable role in increasing human understanding and increasing the human capacity for being more fully human. That's what universities are about. In a culture and society like ours, to understand the fragility of understanding—to recognize that somebody else must be free to speak and think differently because they may have part of an understanding that you don't—is the underpinning of our democracy, the sanctity of the First Amendment, and the reason for the openness of inquiry in universities and colleges.

There is a sacred trust that we in colleges and universities must uphold regarding our responsibility as scholars—to be members of communities that seek and critique, and then distribute understanding beyond our own walls. That is what's sacred about the academic freedom of members of colleges

and universities and what former Stanford president Don Kennedy calls in his recent book "the associated academic duties."

When the home run race was going on between McGwire and Sosa, what really struck me, as much as the incredible interest in these two young men hitting baseballs out of parks, was that from the 55th or 56th home run on, most of the fans who caught the home run ball—knowing full well how valuable it would be if they kept it and sold it—kept giving it back. Giving it back to Mark McGwire. Giving it back to Sammy Sosa. They would interview these folks on television and they would say, "Do you realize how valuable this ball is?" "Yeah." "Why are you giving it back?" And the response would be, "Well, it's not really mine. I may have caught it, I may have it, but it's not really mine."

It also struck me that's what we, as teachers, must be saying. We have invested so much, and others have invested so much in us, developing possession of deeper understanding and knowledge of our fields, but it's not ours to keep! It belongs to others, and we have to devote our lives to giving it away and making it available to others. The neat thing about it—that's why we've got the best jobs in the world—is that we're in a business where we can keep on giving it away and we've still got it.

I believe firmly, as did my late predecessor Ernest Boyer, that teaching, fully understood, is an extraordinary process for creating understanding and knowledge. Certainly, in interactive classrooms—and all classrooms are really interactive—knowledge is created all the time. The meeting of two minds creates something new on a regular basis. We have all been in classrooms where students raise questions that trigger in us conceptions we never had before.

Arguably, one of the two or three most influential books of the last fifty years was Thomas Kuhn's book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. When I was in graduate school, students carried around Kuhn the way folks in China were carrying around Mao's little red book. It was almost a holy text with extraordinary ideas about scientific revolutions. Look how people talk about paradigm shifts today in common parlance who have forgotten that it was Kuhn's concept. That is what Bob Merton calls "obliteration by incorporation;" ideas become so common that you forget their source.

Kuhn was asked, "Where did you get these ideas?" and he said, "Oh, it was very simple. In 1946 I was given the responsibility as a junior fellow at Harvard of creating a new course on the history of physics, so I sat down and began to think through 'what do I know about where ideas in the sciences come from, and how they change under what conditions?'" The more he tried to organize it into a course, the more he realized he was outlining what became a program of scholarship that he carried through for the rest of his career.

You will find that Kuhn's teacher anticipated most of Kuhn's ideas. His teacher was James Conant, professor and chair of chemistry and then president of Harvard, who came back after World War II appalled at how badly the knowledge and understanding of the leaders of this nation reflected any understanding of science and created a course called "On Understanding Science." Tom Kuhn, who was his teaching assistant, didn't forget the influence of that course because Kuhn dedicates his book to his teacher, James Conant.

Teaching is a crucible of understanding. So, you may ask, "What's the problem?" The problem is that our experiences as researchers and teachers are vastly different. Research does not end with our heaving a sigh of relief as we make a

discóvery or make a connection and say "I now understand it." We aren't done with the research until we have displayed it, summarized it, submitted it for peer review, and, once its quality has been attested to, shared it with as much of our community as will pay attention to it. That's what we do as researchers.

As teachers, we're almost like psychotherapists. We have these extraordinary encounters with groups of students—encounters built around our design, interactions, assessments of how the students did, and reflections of how it worked and how we would want to do it differently the next time. We engage in a full active investigation every time we teach a course, and then we bury it in our files, never to see the light of day again until the next time we teach that course and, if we're lucky, we remember in which file we buried it. If not, we say, "What did I do the last time I taught that course?" and go to our students and see if they still have their notes.

Think about the difference between what we do when we start a new research investigation and when we start a new investigation called the design and teaching of a new course. As researchers we know there's research literature. We can go through published and even semi-published accounts of the work of scholars who plowed similar fields. We learn from their successes, we build on both their mistakes and their accomplishments. We expect—and we are expected by our peers—to ground our work on the legacy of others who have worked this field. That is the heart of what it means to do scholarship; we stand on the shoulders of others.

Contrast that to what happens when we're faced with constructing a new course. Where do we turn? Given a new course to teach in a particular area of history, is there literature we can turn to on the teaching of the French Revolution? Have the accounts and critical analyses of such pedagogical

experiments been collated and systematically peer-reviewed so we have a sense of which ones we can depend on? Are they then distributed much like the research literature in other fields so we can build on the critically reviewed experiences of others? Hardly!

In the last few years, we have been excited by the fact that we can read each other's syllabi on the Web, a wonderful move forward. Randy Bass at Georgetown has created a web site with annotated syllabi and case materials in the teaching of American studies. But being satisfied with reading syllabi is like doing a review of the literature and being satisfied with reading the outlines for research proposals, never knowing what the full proposal looked like, never knowing whether the study was ever done--what the results were.

My contention is that we are on the right path. Our institutions have a special role in a free and open society to extend understanding and to change understanding from private property to community property. This special role is scholarship because it has three characteristics: (1) it's not private, but public, (2) it's not only available but critically reviewed by peers, and (3) it can be built upon by others. It's generative. It can be exchanged. People often make fun of scholars because we have such long reference lists. There are even some critics of scholarship now who want to have people write without footnotes: "Just say what you say and be done." They don't understand that without the references, without the footnotes, it's not scholarship! When you're a scholar, the more you realize how dependent you are on the work of other scholars. Our reference lists tell our readers on whose shoulders we stand and where readers can turn to find the beginning of the paths followed by others. Notice that the two most grievous sins of a scholar are plagiary and fraud.

We've all made mistakes by publishing things we realized later were wrong, misinterpreted, or we never replicated, but we did so in good faith and someone else had enough information from our article to replicate it and then to point out our mistake. But the first unforgivable sin of a scholar is plagiary—using something that somebody else gave you freely, and saying you did it yourself. The fundamental morality of the scientific and scholarly community is that we acknowledge the role of others. In fact, the word "acknowledgement," with the word knowledge in its center, implies we can't have knowledge without others. In one of the loveliest lines he ever wrote, Ernest Boyer said that the work of the scholar is incomplete until it is shared with others. And he meant at both levels: teaching the discipline *and* sharing what you've learned through teaching with your peers. Both of these are absolutely critical.

What can we do to make a difference here? What can we do to move ahead in teaching a proper form of scholarship whose work is public, whose work is critically evaluated, and whose work is put into forms that can be exchanged with others? The University of Georgia has, for the last four or five years, been part of a national project experimenting at the department and school level with new approaches to peer review on the quality of teaching. Now notice: peer review is what you do when you're doing research and scholarship in your discipline. Many of your colleagues have made significant contributions in this area. One of the big problems in this field is how do you display your research. Think about it. Somebody's in a biochemistry lab. They spend three years doing a set of experiments, and they have thousands of pages of lab notes. When they're ready to communicate their findings, does it take three years to read the three years of research?

No! We have developed conventions which permit major chunks of that work to come out in fifteen-page journal articles or monographs, the essence of which can often be given in ten minutes at a scientific meeting with slides shown in rapid succession.

How is it possible, in a dozen pages, to summarize a long complex piece of research with enough richness that it can be peer-reviewed and printed for other scholars in the field to use in their own work? This is a miraculous accomplishment because a community of scholars recognize that they're dependent on one another. Scholars are people who are engaged in work none of them could do alone. Their articles and monographs are communications to others who know how to read them, who know what's between the lines, who know what things stand for, and who know the structure of the communication well enough to understand what they're reading.

We don't have anything like that in teaching. So, if I invite you to critically evaluate my teaching, you have two choices. One, you come sit in my classroom. The other, you have me videotape my classroom for three weeks, and then you sit at home with your VCR and—the greatest technological boon to mankind—fast forward!

Again, we do not have economical, rigorous, compressible ways of communicating the scholarship of teaching. We must invent them, and that's where colleagues who are working on teaching portfolios, course portfolios, and other new forms of scholarly work will be fruitful for other members of their discipline. I hasten to add that the future of your various disciplines and professions depends on your success in pedagogically enlightening the next generation of people in your field. This is an aspect of the scholarship in universities that we must redefine as part of the essential mission of the university.

One of the things we've done at the Foundation is to create a new program called the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. It purposely creates an acronym called CASTL, and it does so because Andrew Carnegie's favorite place was his Castle Skybough in Scotland. The Carnegie Academy program has three components, all of which are trying to enhance the scholarship of teaching—not only in colleges and universities, but in elementary and secondary schools as well. The first component is the Center for Advanced Study. As you know, there are centers for advanced study in many fields. I was privileged to spend a year at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, where I was able to sit in my study and do my own thing for nearly a year.

In the North Carolina Research Triangle there is the National Humanities Center, and at Stanford there is the Stanford Humanities Center. There are centers of this sort for leading scholars and artists—Bellagio, Rockefeller Center, Lake Como—where people who engage in the research of their discipline have a chance to work under ideal conditions. Where do those who do the scholarship of teaching in their discipline go? Well, they're now going to be able to go to the Carnegie Teaching Academy.

The first aspect of the program is what we call the Pew Scholars Program. The Pew Charitable Trust has made a major gift to the Foundation to help us develop a center for advanced study where people who are devoting their scholarly energies to the scholarship of teaching—in history, in mathematics, in biology, in management, in performing arts, in education—will have a place to do their work and work with others who are interested in the same sorts of problems. As we know, the work of any individual in higher education

sits at the crossroads of their institution and their discipline. It is often said that the more committed to research a university is, the less loyal to the institution scholars are, and the more they feel like members of their disciplinary community.

Both are important. Just having an advanced study center in the hills of Palo Alto will be nothing but a symbolic gesture. So the second aspect of our program, working collaboratively with the American Association for Higher Education, is fostering the development of eighty campus-based teaching academies in the next five years. We need places on every campus—not only research universities but liberal arts and community colleges—where resources enhance the development and propagation of the scholarship of teaching. Each should network with similar academies at other institutions so that they can interact with each other the way other research communities do.

We thought we would work with eighty institutions, but within a month of the first public announcement of the program, we received over one hundred requests from institutions that want to create teaching academies. Some requests came from individual institutions and some came from consortia. A group of Christian colleges in South Carolina said, "This is exactly what we've been looking for. Not one of us can do this alone, but what if we create a joint academy for support of the scholarship of teaching in all our institutions?" The Associated New American Colleges, a couple of dozen colleges in a consortium of another kind, have also asked to be treated as a group. We've received individual inquiries from large universities like Brown, Princeton, Carnegie Mellon, Wisconsin, and Ohio State and from community colleges like Maricopa and Foothill-DeAnza.

The notion of creating campus academies should be seen as a national experiment. Each one should be somewhat different and faithful to local conditions, rather than trying prematurely to have a single structure for all. At Emory, the provost came to see me and said "we're not going to have one teaching academy, we're going to make it possible for multiple smaller academies to be located in specific departments and schools." I'm not sure if that's the best way to do it, but then again that's why one has experiments of this kind.

The third piece of the CASTL program is working with disciplinary and professional associations: the American Historical Association, the American Chemical Society—and the Mathematical Association of America, whose president is going to be a Pew Scholar this coming summer. We're going to ask them how the scholarship of teaching can move from the periphery to the center in their discipline or profession? For example, how can the work of teaching history not be set aside in special journals for the teaching of history but work its way into the core scholarly journals? Before you say, "That would never work," let me remind you that the most prestigious medical journal in the United States—the *New England Journal of Medicine*—has so many articles to publish that it publishes weekly, and every issue includes a clinical case from the Massachusetts General Hospital. This prestigious journal recognizes that the complexities of practice have theoretical implications just as theory should always have practical implications.

There is a role for universities, especially in the invention and investment in their own teaching academies, to push this work ahead. I'm convinced that once we have a scholarship of teaching, and it becomes public, peer-reviewed, and exchangeable—some of your best scholars of teaching may be

recruited by Emory and Stanford, or by Vanderbilt and Michigan, because they won't be invisible any more. As John Gardner said to me a while back, "We'll know that teaching is important when places start competing with others for the best teachers and the best scholars of teaching." I think also, when there's a scholarship of teaching, we'll find that we're no longer talking about people not being promoted because they taught too well.

Let me conclude by going back to Louise McBee who demonstrated that one can move, from the body academic to the body politic. Talking with her, one would discover that as a legislator she still views her work as educating. Public servants as educators are those who try to spread a vision of the possible and desirable as persuasively and effectively as they can. That's very much what we do as teachers.

I am reminded of a wonderful editorial by Tom Friedman, the New York Times editorial writer. He spent two weeks in China studying the rapidity with which the Chinese are attempting to create a market economy in their socialist state. My mother and dad's little delicatessen in Chicago would fit right in some of those clogged streets in Beijing where little stores are becoming new elements of the economy. Friedman made a fascinating observation that is exactly on target. He said, "The Chinese are trying to graft a free-market economy, onto a fundamentally controlled society." The way he put it was, "They'll find painfully that you can't move from Mao to Milken without stopping at Madison." If the society is to become a free market, economically as well as socially, it has to be a free market not only of products and money, but of ideas and aspirations. That kind of freedom lies at the heart of a democracy, and that kind of democracy lies at the heart of what it takes to create a market economy. Thank you very much.

About the Lecturer

Lee S. Shulman is the eighth president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. He also is the Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education and Psychology at Stanford University. He was previously on the faculty of Michigan State University where he was Professor of Educational Psychology and Medical Education and founding co-director of the Institute for Research on Teaching.

A native of Chicago, he received a bachelor's degree in philosophy from the University of Chicago where he also received a master's and doctorate in educational psychology in 1963. Since that time he has conducted research to understand the way in which various kinds of knowledge—of content, of pedagogy, of learners, and of knowledge in particular subject areas—foster good teaching. These investigations have involved extensive longitudinal studies of how new teachers learn to teach at all levels and in all core disciplines. Recently he has led a major national project sponsored by the American Association of Higher Education wherein practices in college teaching have been examined in terms of a scholarly and peer-reviewed activity.

Dr. Shulman is former president of the American Educational Research Association, where he received the career award for Distinguished Contributions to Educational Research.He is also past president of the National Academy of Education and has received the American Psychological Association's E. L. Thorndike Award for distinguished Psychological Contributions to Education. Shulman has also been a Guggenheim Fellow and a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

About the Lecture Series

The Louise McBee Lectureship in Higher Education honors Dr. M. Louise McBee, vice president for academic affairs emerita of The University of Georgia. The lectureship, established in 1988, is filled annually by a distinguished scholar or public figure in the field of higher education or with expertise in that area. The McBee lecturer visits the University campus to deliver lectures, conduct seminars, and take part in the life of the University. The lectureship is housed in the Institute of Higher Education where Dr. McBee served as a member of the faculty.

Louise McBee is a native of Strawberry Plains, Tennessee. She earned a Bachelor of Science degree from East Tennessee State College in 1946, a Master of Arts from Columbia University in 1951, and a Ph.D. from the Ohio State University in 1961. Dr. McBee's career began as a high school teacher in Marion, Virginia, and includes eleven years in various positions at East Tennessee State University where she served as dean of women. Since 1963, she has held several posts with The University of Georgia including dean of women, associate dean of students, dean of students, assistant vice president for instruction, associate and senior associate vice president for academic affairs, and acting vice president for academic affairs.

Throughout her tenure at the University, Dr. McBee won the high regard of students, faculty, alumni, and friends of the institution for her openness, candor, honesty, and integrity as well as for her consummate skill as a university administrator. As a Fulbright scholar and as author or co-author of four books and of numerous scholarly articles, she also enjoys the approbation of the scholarly world. She is the recipient of

numerous awards and honors, having served as the national president of the Alpha Lambda Delta Honor Society, as vice president of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, and as trustee and secretary of the Kathryn Phillips Trust Fund. In 1988, she received the Abraham Baldwin award from The University of Georgia Alumni Society for distinguished service to the University. She retired in 1988 and has moved into that phase of her life with customary vigor and enthusiasm. Dr. McBee continues to serve the University and academic community through her efforts in the General Assembly of Georgia. Now in her fourth term as a state representative, she has been vital in bringing higher education issues to the attention of the public as a member of the University System of Georgia Committee, and vice chair of the Committee on Children and Youth. Most recently she was instrumental in establishing the Governor's Teaching Fellows, a program designed to assist in the improvement of undergraduate instruction through the continuing professional education of teaching faculty members in the state's colleges and universities.

Louise McBee Lecture Committee
Thomas G. Dyer, Chairman
Cameron Fincher
Larry G. Jones
Carol V. Winthrop

Previous Louise McBee Lectures

Patricia Albjerg Graham
Dean, Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
Collaborating for Children and Schools: The Role of Higher Education
October 5, 1989

K. Patricia Cross
Elizabeth and Edward Conner Professor of Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley
College Teaching: What Do We Know About It?
October 25, 1990

Alexander W. Astin
Professor of Higher Education
Director, Higher Education Research Institute
University of California, Los Angeles
The Unrealized Potential of American Higher Education
November 7, 1991

Paul K. Conkin
Distinguished Professor of History
Vanderbilt University
The Mature but Anxious University: Hungry, Captive, Politicized, and Deconstructed
November 19, 1992

Judith Lanier
President, Michigan Partnership for New Education
Michigan State University
Finding Common Ground: The Real World and the University
November 4, 1993

Hanna H. Gray
Henry Pratt Judson Distinguished Service Professor of History
The University of Chicago
President, The University of Chicago, 1978-1993
The Higher Learning in America: A Reconsideration
November 18, 1994

James Downey
President, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada
The University as Trinity:
Balancing Corporation, Collegium, and Community
October 26, 1995

Katharine C. Lyall
President, The University of Wisconsin System
Once and Future Partners: The State and Its University
October 28, 1996

C. Peter Magrath
President, National Association of State Universities
and Land-Grant Colleges
The Universities of the 21st Century: Reform and Renewal
October 16, 1997